

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Inventor:	Ryutaro YAMANAKA et al.	Art Unit 2618
Appln. No.:	10/530,208	Exr. J. Young
Filed:	April 4, 2005	Conf. No. 9601
For:	COMMUNICATION APPARATUS AND COMMUNICATION APPARATUS RECONFIGURATION METHOD	

SUMMARY OF SUBSTANCE OF PERSONAL INTERVIEW

Assistant Commissioner of Patents
Washington, DC 20231

Sir:

This is a summary of the substance of a personal interview conducted on November 8, 2007. The participants in the interview were Examiner Janelle Young and David Ward, a representative of the Applicants. Claims 1 and 17 were discussed and distinguished over the applied art of record: Dapper (US 6,487,405), Neumann et al. (US 2002/0141441), Buhrmann et al. (US 5,854,984), and Silver et al. (US 5,828,949). More particularly, the following rejections were discussed and the Applicants' representative argued for allowance:

(1) Claims 1-12 and 17 under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Dapper (US 6,487,405) in view of Neumann et al. (US 2002/0141441);

(2) Claims 13 and 14 under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Dapper in view of Neumann and Buhrmann et al. (US 5,854,984); and

(3) Claims 15 and 16 under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Dapper in view of Neumann, Buhrmann, and Silver et al. (US 5,828,949).

The Applicants' representative noted that the Final Rejection proposes that Neumann teaches the features defined by claim 1 of:

(1) a first baseband signal processor that executes baseband signal processing common to a plurality of radio communication systems and
(2) a reconfiguring section that reconfigures only a second baseband signal processor, without reconfiguring the first baseband signal processor, upon switching among radio communication systems.

The Applicants' representative noted that, however, Neumann discloses, in Figs. 5A-8B, a GSM master processor 202 that executes baseband processing for GSM communication and a TDMA processor 204 that executes baseband processing for TDMA communication (see Neumann abstract, lines 1-4). The Applicants' representative noted that, more simply, Neumann discloses two processors that each perform baseband processing independently for a single type of communication signal, wherein one processor performs this processing only for GSM signals and the other processor performs this processing only for TDMA signals (see paragraphs [0038]-[0040]).

The Applicants' representative noted that the Final Rejection acknowledges that Dapper does not supplement the teachings of Neumann in this regard (see Final Rejection section 2, second and third paragraphs).

Accordingly, the Applicants' representative argued that Dapper and Neumann, considered individually or in combination, do not render obvious the subject matter defined by claim 1. The Applicants' representative noted that independent claim 17 similarly recites the above-mentioned features distinguishing apparatus claim 1 from the applied references, but with respect to a method. Therefore, the Applicants' representative argued that the rejections applied to claims 13-16 should be deemed overcome and allowance of claims 1 and 17 and all claims dependent therefrom is warranted.

The examiner stated her belief that Neumann et al. do not explicitly teach the claim limitation of two baseband processors but stated her belief that the original application does not seem to provide support for the claimed subject matter of a communication apparatus having first and second baseband signal processors. Accordingly, the examiner indicated she may issue a new office action applying a 35 USC 112, first paragraph, rejection to claims 1-17.

No agreement was reached regarding the patentability of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

/James Edward Ledbetter/

Date: November 17, 2007
JEL/DWW/att

James E. Ledbetter
Registration No. 28,732

Attorney Docket No. L9289.05121
STEVENS DAVIS, MILLER & MOSHER, L.L.P.
1615 L Street, N.W., Suite 850
P.O. Box 34387
Washington, D.C. 20043-4387
Telephone: (202) 785-0100
Facsimile: (202) 408-5200